

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 8, 9, 12, and 18-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Portuesi (USP 5,981,509). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Portuesi discloses, in Fig. 5, a system for distributing a video signal having encoded uniform network resource locators including an encoding system 52 (e.g., a cable network local TV station) and a decoding system 56 (e.g., a personal residence). The decoding system 56 includes: a video receiver 66 that receives encoded video signals with embedded URLs through a distribution network 54; a URL decode unit 68 that strips out URL data from the encoded video signal and generates video including the embedded URL to be provided to a display 70, and provides decoded URL data to be provided to a URL processing unit 72; a user interface 74, which includes a Web browser 76, in communication with the URL processing unit 72.

As stated above, the URL decode unit 68 (corresponds to the “separation unit” of the claimed invention of the present application) separates the encoded video signal into the video signal with the embedded URL, which are provided directly to the display 60, and into the decoded URL data, which is provided to the URL processing unit 72.

Portuesi also states, in col. 6, lines 31-33, that a hot spot (corresponds to the “button data” of the present invention) is associated with the embedded URL is displayed during playback of a movie file 8 (see Fig. 2).

Portuesi, however, is not provided with a “memory” that “accumulates the separated button data.” Accordingly, Portuesi does not disclose or suggest the “memory” as recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 8, 12, and 18 are allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

Claim 9, dependent on claim 8, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 8.

Claim 19, dependent on claim 18, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 18.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 2 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2, dependent on claim 1, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 1.

Claim 17 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 10, 11, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of Narayan et al. (USP 6,859,937). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1, Portuesi fails to disclose or suggest the “memory” as recited in independent claims 10 and 13.

Narayan discloses displaying an E-mail button 104 on a screen display. In Narayan, the user is presented with an E-mail page that shows the e-mail activity for the identified user. From the E-mail page, the user may perform typical e-mail functions from a button bar 132, such as write new e-mail 134, administer e-mail addresses 135, or modify e-mail settings 136.

Narayan, however, fails to disclose or suggest the “memory” as recited in claims 10 and 13.

Accordingly, even assuming that Portuesi and Narayan can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Portuesi in view of Narayan fails to disclose or suggest the “memory” recited in claims 10 and 13 because none of these references disclose or suggest such a “memory.”

Claim 11, dependent on claim 10, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 10.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(c) Claims 14-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of Narayan, in further view of Shaw et al. (USP 6,516,341). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 14-16, dependent on claim 13, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 13.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(d) Claims 3-5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of White. (2006/0010478). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated in the foregoing with regard to claims 10 and 13, both Portuesi and Narayan fail to disclose or suggest the “memory” as recited in independent claim 3.

White merely discloses creating an email by hitting a Return key on a keyboard.

White, however, does not have a “memory” that “accumulates the separated button data.”

Accordingly, even assuming that Portuesi, Narayan, and White can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Portuesi in view of Narayan, and further in view of White fails to disclose or suggest the “memory” recited in claim 3 because none of these references disclose or suggest such a “memory.”

Claim 4, 5, and 7, variously dependent on claim 3, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 3.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims in the present application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it raises no new issues. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it places the application in better form for Appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No.: 09/898,014
Reply dated April 24, 2006
to Office Action of January 25, 2006
Page 14 of 14

Docket No.: 0033-0736P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant